UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 98-CR-500(FB)

-against-

: United States Courthouse

1

: Brooklyn, New York

RASENE MYTON,

: Wednesday, October 18, 2023

: 11:00 a.m.

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR RESENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE FREDERIC BLOCK UNITED STATES SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Eastern District of New York 271 Cadman Plaza East

Brooklyn, New York 11201

BY: DREW G. ROLLE, ESQ.

Assistant United States Attorney

For the Defendant:

FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK

For the Defendant -

Rasene Myton

One Pierrepont Plaza

16th Floor

Brooklyn, New York 11201

BY: MICHAEL K. SCHNEIDER, ESQ.

Court Reporter: Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI

> Official Court Reporter Telephone: (718) 613-2487 Facsimile: (718) 613-2694

E-mail: Anthony_Frisolone@nyed.uscourts.gov

Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography. Transcript produced by Computer-aided Transcription.

	Resentencing 2				
1	(In open court.)				
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Criminal cause for				
3	resentencing, United States v. Myton.				
4	Counsel, please state your appearances.				
5	MR. ROLLE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Drew				
6	Rolle for the United States.				
7	THE COURT: Good afternoon.				
8	MR. SCHNEIDER: Federal Defenders by Michael				
9	Schneider for Mr. Myton.				
10	Good afternoon.				
11	THE COURT: So, Mr. Rolle, am I pronouncing your				
12	name correctly?				
13	MR. ROLLE: Yes, your Honor.				
14	THE COURT: I don't think you were here when we				
15	had this sentence back in 2005.				
16	MR. ROLLE: I think everybody on the dais was				
17	here. I don't know where I was.				
18	THE COURT: How long have you been with the office				
19	now?				
20	MR. ROLLE: Since 2016.				
21	THE COURT: So you had to really familiar yourself				
22	with Myton and Bernard and all those wonderful people.				
23	MR. ROLLE: Yes, I had his original his habeas				
24	in 2016.				
25	THE COURT: Keep your voice up because my hearing				

is going.

MR. ROLLE: I had his habeas since 2016, so I've kept track.

THE COURT: It's a long history here, obviously. But I think that before we get into the niceties of recalculating everything, it's a trial de novo. It's a sentence de novo. So we want to talk a little bit about some of the less important things and get them out of the way first.

So de novo, if you take the word seriously, means "from the beginning." But we don't have to go all the way back to the beginning because I think we could all agree that there's certain parts that we don't have to be concerned about: No fine, we had a whole proceeding, we had a whole sentence, we did not require restitution, and we did require three years of supervised release. And, of course, there was a hundred dollar special assessment for each of the seven which now should reduced to 500 and not 700. I don't know if he's paid any of that, but I think we can possibly all agree that all of these things will still say in place so we can go forward with what really is different from the time we were sentenced.

Is that a fair assumption?

MR. ROLLE: I think it generally, your Honor, the normal sort of explanation as to the §3553(a) factors, all of

Resentencing 4 that will have to happen and the special assessment will go 1 2 to 500. 3 THE COURT: Yes, I think those are the things that 4 have it be dealt with. Really, we can agree that everything else pretty much stays the way it was way back when. 5 I think it's certainly up to --6 MR. ROLLE: 7 THE COURT: Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, I will note that Mr. Myton 8 9 has paid the surcharge, the \$700 surcharge. 10 THE COURT: Pardon me. MR. SCHNEIDER: He has paid all the financial 11 12 penalties. 13 THE COURT: Has he paid 700? 14 MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. 15 THE COURT: So he gets a \$200 refund, I guess. MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know how that's going to 16 17 work. 18 THE COURT: I don't know how that works out. On a prior case where I had this type of dynamic, there was a 19 20 restitution that was outstanding so we applied the so-called 21 "refund" to the restitution but we don't have that here. 22 So, Mr. Rolle, you're going to have to figure out 23 how he gets \$200. 24 MR. ROLLE: I'm not sure he's entitled to it, but 25 we'll look at it to the extent that restitution is a

question. I understand from the record there was -restitution was mandatory, there were funeral expenses for
the victim that the prosecutors at the time had the had
proffered. And then, ultimately, for whatever reason, the
parties agreed not to impose it.

THE COURT: I know that.

Anyway, look, you can just submit me some letter, follow-up letter, has to how you folks agree or not agree on the \$200. That's the least of the problems that we have here, okay? So is there a fair way to process that little thing so we can get that out of the way?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

Now, I'm here with a long history of Mr. Myton. We've grown-up together to some extent. We had the underlying trial back in 2005, was it, 2004, thereabouts.

MR. SCHNEIDER: 2001 was the trial.

THE COURT: 2001. So I was just on the bench for about five or six years at that time. And this was a case I still remember, after all the passage of time, because we had police officers who were part of this gang and it was a pretty, pretty horrendous violent type of dynamic. So I had to refresh myself a little bit about this history that goes back 20 years. And, of course, Mr. Myton has not been bashful about making all sorts of applications during the

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Resentencing

course of his incarceration, and he is certainly entitled to 2 do that, and it has paid off because here we are today. 3 There is going to be a resentence because of the ultimate 4 decisions we got. We waited a long time for the Supreme Court and the Second Circuit to tell us that robbery is a 5 crime of violence, attempted robbery is not a crime of 7 violence. And I think just a couple of weeks of weeks ago 8 they affirmed my decision in <u>Tavares</u> which said that conspiracy is a crime of violence. 9

So we have this, sort of, combination of dynamics here that have brought us here today. I guess the question that I want the Government to think about is that you were not here for Bernard, who was the attorney who handled?

MR. ROLLE: It was another AUSA with whom I've spoken and reviewed the filings.

I went over the minutes of that THE COURT: proceeding that goes back in May and I gave him time served which was about 21 years at that time. So he's out and he is the one that actual little pulled the trigger that resulted in Davis's death. I'm not absolutely still clear that Myton was very much part and parcel of that even though he wasn't the person who shot him and I spoke about that throughout the years about his complicity. nonetheless, Kingsley Bernard, 21 years, time served. out, free man now at the anal of 48 or 49. And how do you

> Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

deal with Myton when you have to think about comparative sentencing for people similarly situated, I'm not so sure they are. But you're going to have to talk to me about that because when you ask for 80 years and Kingsley was out after 20 years or 21 years, that's something which I cannot accommodate, okay, right now. You can talk more about them and it's a serious matter, okay?

And Mr. Schneider, from your perspective, Kingsley was an extraordinary rehabilitated prisoner. And your colleague Ms. Eisner-Grynberg did a terrific job and you had a very good staff there that convinced me that time served was appropriate there.

And primarily because of extraordinary rehabilitation, he really rang the bell for what would have otherwise possibly been yet another compassionate release decision I would have rendered but not for the fact I didn't have to go there considering the fact that we had to eliminate the gun charges, right?

So how does Myton stack up compared to Kingsley Bernard. I don't think he stacks up to Kingsley Bernard at all. To some extent, yes, and a lot of ways, no. I look at him as really being so inextricably involved in long-term horrendous acts of criminal behavior over a decade. And he was a major force in a lot of these crimes which are part of his convictions which Kingsley Bernard was not part of.

Kingsley did pull the trigger and your client did not pull the trigger.

So these are the itinerant thoughts I want to share with you before we even get through the recalculation, so to speak, of the guidelines which is move of a technical thing than it really is what really counts in terms of how you treat a person at sentencing.

So these are preliminary comments. A little homework assignment for both of you to think about as we go through the proceeding. Having said that, let me identify for the record what I have here.

And I assume, Mr. Schneider, that your client is prepared to be resentenced today.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. In no necessary order, the last thing I read is the Government's submission which I received this morning. It's dated October 18th and that's where the Government is looking for 80 years, and so, ten years offset because of the fact we can't count the attempted robbery anymore is sufficient. Well, you know my thoughts about that.

Now, I'm a little bit late today because you wanted me to read this, I take it. So I had a conflict: If I read this, I would a little late in court. If I didn't read it, I would be here on time.

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

MR. ROLLE: I appreciate it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I know it's late in coming but I appreciate what you did. And it was really well done because some times I don't agree with the 80 years because it's not going to happen. You did give me a good history of the background of it. You had to do a lot of work to really get me so up to speed on this, I appreciate it.

MR. ROLLE: Certainly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then, I go back to -- I have Kingsley
Bernard's amended judgment here going back to May 31st. And
I pulled that out because I do think it should be part of
the sentencing files since it is very relevant to really
reflect upon it as I just mentioned.

So we have the underlying presentence report which -- and the addendums to it -- which go back to January 7, 2005. And then we have the addendums to the presentence report. And I have an addendum dated September 20, 2023. Then I have a second addendum dated October 18, 2023, which is today. So I have reviewed all of that and we're going to have to make revised calculations based upon all of that.

Now, the underlying sentence that I imposed back in 2005, I have that in my file. I have the mandate from the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. And I got in my file all the addenda going back to 2005. I don't think I have to

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

spell it out specifically unless you want me to. And I have the -- and my decision and the circuit court's decision. I put that in the file as well. I've got some letters that I put in the file that go back to October 2, 2023. This is sort of printed to me and it's from Liston Watson, and so, he we'll talk about him. I think he's a correction officer or -- I don't know what his position is but he speaks well of Mr. Myton's so-called rehabilitation. And I have the sentencing recommendation of the probation department that goes back to December 13, 2002. So I have all the prior papers as well.

Is there anything else that I should have in my file here that may be would bear upon what we're going to be doing today. I think I got it pretty much done.

Mr. Schneider.

MR. SCHNEIDER: No, your Honor. I'm sorry, you obviously have our submission of October 12th.

THE COURT: Yes.

So let's now go through making the revised sentencing calculations. Look at the addendum of September 20, 2023. And the second addendum, of course, tells us that we should not count the Gross Jewelry Store robbery because he was acquitted of that and that was a profound and important change, and certainly, a relevant change to the addendum which I'm going to talk about now.

So let's see whether we can turn to the calculations and get that out of the way. We know what it's going to add up to. Unless you want me to spend the next 20 minutes going through each of these in particular, there are many of them because of the...

MR. ROLLE: And I don't believe there is any objection to any of the calculations that's set out in the addendum.

THE COURT: We wind up with the adjusted offense level of 43. We know it's going to be the case one way or the other.

Mr. Schneider, what do you say? Can we accept that as the adjusted offense level?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. Your Honor made that finding at the original sentence that Mr. Myton was culpable for the robbery that ended in the murder and, therefore, the guideline level is 43.

THE COURT: It is 43. You know, I remember very specifically it could be concerned way back when that he wasn't the triggerman, but he was so inextricably involved in planning it. And I was particularly taken by the fact that he was the one who dumped the body and planned to dump then body, et cetera, et cetera. I spoke about that in the past. Even though he was not the triggerman, as far as I'm concerned, I can see him clearly coequal with Kingsley

Bernard in terms of the murder of Davis. So that's 43.

I have in Paragraph 354 some disciplinary incidents. I don't think they're really anything major, I'm not terribly concerned about that.

We have the second addendum as I mentioned dated October 18th which accepts the defendant's counsel's objections to Paragraph 354.

And the other paragraphs that you objected to. So I think the record reflects all you of that, right?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. The only issue outstanding, and I don't know that it's going to be relevant, is the mandatory minimum that must be imposed on the remaining §924(c) count.

THE COURT: That's seven years compared to five years?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Right.

It's my position, and I think it's pretty much black letter law, that since the brandishing was not charged in the indictment, it's a five-year mandatory minimum. But, of course, that's just the minimum, the Court can impose a sentence up to life on that count.

THE COURT: I think the seven years is correct.

Look, he's going to get a big break here today. Not going to be what you want, not going to be what the Government wants, but it's going to be a significant change in his

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

13 Resentencing future. 1 2 But I think the seven years is right because I 3 think the brandishing relevant conduct. I've considered 4 that and I think the fact that the gun was used to pistol whip, or whatever that was, Leon, I think it was Leon Black. 5 Leon King? 6 7 MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't recall that. 8 THE COURT: One of the victims. 9 MR. ROLLE: Ristolo. 10 THE COURT: I went over that and I am satisfied he really met standard of brandishing. So I consider that as 11 12 relevant conduct even though it wasn't part of a particular 13 specific charge, okay? 14 MR. SCHNEIDER: I think -- I don't argue with the Court's reasoning. My point is simply that the mandatory 15 16 minimum was five years. The Court is certainly authorized 17 under the statute to impose seven. It may be helpful to 18 make that finding should there be an appeal here. That's my 19 only point. 20 THE COURT: Keep your record, make your record. 21 It would not surprise me if we have more Myton papers to 22 deal with after today. 23 MR. ROLLE: Your Honor, I think the judgment as to 24 that count is unchanged.

MR. SCHNEIDER: No, that -- first of all, I'm not

sure that was the count that received -- no, it has to be changed because the §924(c) counts received either a 5, a 20, or a 25 year sentence at the time.

THE COURT: It's either five or seven.

MR. SCHNEIDER: So you would have change the sentence no matter what.

THE COURT: I think seven is right. And you can preserve your rights, of course, to an appeal. I'm going to tell him right now he has a right to appeal before I forget it which I usually do and let me get that out the way.

So if he wants to do that, he'll have to file a

Notice of Appeal within 14 days from the date that the

judgment will be entered and have to perfect it within

30 days thereafter unless gets an extension of time from the

Second Circuit Court of Appeals, I suspect.

So we've taken care of that.

So what we have here is the 20-year cap on all of these Hobbs Act robberies. And that includes the one that was involved with the death of Davis as well. And so, what it comes down to, I've had to deal with this before, is I got the discretion to run them all concurrent which I don't think I'm going to do but you can try to talk me into doing that or to tack on some consecutive time. But the guideline calculation here is 20 years on each of those. If I do keep those all concurrent, then we're left with the one dealing

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

15 Resentencing with the murder of Davis and I can either say 20 years 1 2 concurrent on that, or I have the discretion to say I'm 3 going to add that 20 years on consecutively or parts of it. 4 I guess that's the way the law breaks out. And then we have to have the seven-year tack-on for the gun charge. 5 So if I do run all of the Hobbs Act robberies 6 7 concurrently except the Davis one, we're talking about 8 240 months. If I want to run the Davis one consecutively, 9 that would be another 240 months; that's 480 months. 10 on top of that, we have to have the 84 months for the gun 11 I think I got that down right. So if we did that, we're looking at 480 plus 84. 12 13 Which would be 564 months. Once again that would be 14 predicated upon 20 years concurrent for all of the non-murder robberies and another 240 months for the Davis 15 16 one, and 84 for the, I think, it's 564 if my math is 17 correct. 18 MR. SCHNEIDER: That would be 47 years, whatever 19 that is no months. 20 MR. ROLLE: 564. 21 THE COURT: I think 564 is the same as 47 years. 22 MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe so.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe so.
MR. ROLLE: Yes.
THE COURT: So that would be 47 years.
And presumably, he would get credit for good time

23

24

apparently so that would knock off, you know, a bunch of years and he may be looking at getting freedom at about the age of 70 if I calculate this correctly. So I'm not going to go higher than that. I think anything higher than that is not really appropriate especially when I compare this to Kingsley Bernard. So anyway that's my thinking.

MR. ROLLE: Sure.

THE COURT: But I want the Government to have the opportunity to tell me why I should go higher than that and want Mr. Schneider to have the opportunity to tell me why I should be lower than that. And then I have to make the difficult decisions that is the most difficult part of being a district court judge, okay?

You go first, Mr. Rolle.

MR. ROLLE: Sure, your Honor. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard.

So in terms of this case, this defendant, situated in a case you presided over and know quite well.

THE COURT: I know it well.

MR. ROLLE: Very well. Certainly better than anyone sitting here as the lawyers on this case at this point.

This case is not just about the murder, the death, and killing and murder of Davis during one robbery. That was a significant event, it was a significant count, a

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

Resentencing

Honor. There was a first trial and there was a reason why there was two trials was because this defendant led, he led, a robbery crew for more than ten years. That fact alone distinguishes him from Bernard. Bernard certainly pulled the trigger and killed a man in the course of a robbery. This defendant planned and assisted and disposed of the body. This case is just not simply about that moment in time and I think that's what was important. It was important to what we said in our papers. It was important to this court's sentencing 20 years ago.

THE COURT: I agree with that conceptually, by the way.

MR. ROLLE: And I think we can't lose sight of that and I think that's what justifies sentencing him very much differently than Bernard at the end of the day. When you read through the PSR that came out in 2005, Bernard is not mentioned as nearly as much has Myton, and that's because of the role he played. Now, the times he was mentioned were quite heinous and each of those points, at least on one of them, the defendant was there, right there by his side which is why your Honor found him inextricably intertwined with the killing that occurred.

But I think looking at each of robberies that didn't kill anyone by themselves would absolutely support a

Resentencing

sentence of 80 years, a sentence of life. Less than an hour ago in this courthouse, Judge Chin sentenced carjackers who committed one gunpoint carjacking, kidnapped one person, and pistol whipped one person over the course of a year to 24 years, to 24 years, that happened an hour ago.

Over the course of more than ten years, this defendant helped kidnap, pistol whip in front of a baby.

One of his victims was holding an 18-month old child at the time that he beat the mother over the face with a gun; beat the father over the face with a gun.

The conduct recounted in the PSR is some of the most shocking conduct you can conceive of. The bad old days of New York City were here because Rasene Myton brought everyone to it. He was captaining the ship in the '90s. These are the Hobbs Act robbery crews of the Southern District of New York and Eastern District of New York brought time and time again these heinous and violent robberies and that can't be overlooked. And the reason it still supports it today is that the 22-year sentence they're asking you for is totally at odds with every §3553(a) factor, the rehabilitation on which it's built is not existent and does not compare to Kingsley Bernard.

THE COURT: We have a very compelling letter from the prison and -- who is this gentleman again? I don't remember what his position was, but the Lieutenant Watson.

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

MR. SCHNEIDER: So, your Honor, in our mitigation submission there's several attachments. Attachment C is a letter from Liston Watson who was an inmate at FCI Berlin where Mr. Myton has been several years. So he wrote a letter to the Court that you received separately, but I also attached it.

THE COURT: I saw that. But he's an inmate.

MR. SCHNEIDER: He's an inmate. I've also attached three letters from employees he the Bureau of Prisons --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SCHNEIDER: -- as Attachment D to our letter.

MR. ROLLE: So we recognize, your Honor --

THE COURT: I assume that's part of §3553(a) mix those letters.

MR. ROLLE: And I think worth almost nothing. Because at the end of the day, the fact that he treated well the people charged with keeping in him in custody and didn't attack or brutalize the inmates he was housed with. Should he have shown such compassion to the victims, he wouldn't be here. But he did and I don't think not -- I don't think complying with what you're expected to do in custody is worth 60 less years than your Honor imposed. A sentence less than he asked you for in 2005 when they said 25 years was enough. It wasn't enough then, it's not enough now.

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

THE COURT: I think he was assessed as a low risk of recidivism. I read something about that.

MR. ROLLE: Understood, your Honor.

I think that's not the entire sentencing calculus. I'm also not quite sure what we can really say. I'm not sure the sample size of offenders with this type of underlying crime really can be borne out in a matrix that they've cited to you. I think he is so unique in the level and scope of the underlying robbery crimes that he can't be analogized to other people in the matrix. There are not people in the United States going back to the '90s who committed crimes like this. It's a select group of people prosecuted in the Second Circuit, in the Southern District and Eastern District of New York.

THE COURT: So let me interrupt, also.

I'm thinking about Bernard. He was a poster child for an extraordinary rehabilitation while he was incarcerated. I think everybody agreed to that, I think. The Government agreed that was extraordinary, right? And so, that was a major §3553(a) factor, so there's no question about it. I don't think he measures up to that bar here, quite frankly. But I have to consider this as part of the matrix, as part of the farrago, my new favorite word, of the sentencing dynamics under §3553(a). I'm not saying it's going to be a dominant one but certainly it's worthy of some

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

21 Resentencing 1 consideration I suspect, okay? 2 MR. ROLLE: Your Honor, as to Bernard. I've been 3 speaking with the counsel who handled the sentencing, and I 4 think reflected in our letter, we asked for a guideline 5 sentence which I think recognized and accounted for the 6 rehabilitation. I think we're doing the same thing here. 7 THE COURT: The other thing that strikes me is 8 that all these other terrible people: Padmore, I remember 9 all of them. Who was the cop again that was involved here? 10 Maybe it was more than one. They're out, they're all 11 sentenced over the course of years and I think they all 12 have -- I think they're all free people today. 13 think anybody else in is in jail. The sentences ranged, 14 they're all individual sentences, but he's the number one 15 guy. 16 MR. ROLLE: I think Francisco Lake. 17 THE COURT: Lake is still. 18 MR. ROLLE: You amended his sentence but he has 19 many years to serve. 20 THE COURT: Lake is still there? 21 MR. ROLLE: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Aside from Lake. Lake and Myton were 23 the ones who really, I guess, for lack of a better word, 24 were the major criminal activists here in so to speak.

MR. ROLLE:

Certainly, over the timeline that we

have to look at. I think we could go incident by incident and say, well, I stayed in the car. Well, I didn't bind his hands, I only drove away.

THE COURT: He was inextricably involved with a lot of bad things over a long period of time. That's why his sentence is going to be higher, and has been higher, than all the others possibly with the exception of Lake.

MR. ROLLE: Yes. And just to underscore a point we made in our letter. And I think this is important, and I think it's salient, and I think it's unusual. We certainly don't take issue with someone fighting their convictions and attempting to take advantage of changes in law and different judges' perspectives on what is a crime of violence and all these esoteric exercises we do as lawyers. But it does inform you as to what was his perspective on what he had done and his acceptance of responsibility. What were the arguments he made to your Honor in seeking to unwind his sentence?

And I looked as closely as I could to as many filings as I could from over the last 20 years in this case, he has almost nine dockets in the Second Circuit, he has four dockets in this district court, littered with filings. At no point does he reflect upon what he did, acknowledge what he did. And you may say, well, he's litigating legal points and why would he say that.

Resentencing

But the arguments he made were ones like: I shouldn't be held responsible for Orlando Davis's killing. He made that argument less than a few years ago where he's still continued to say: It's not my problem. That's relevant. That is incredibly relevant to understand. Has he accepted responsibility and understood the harm he's caused to this world and this city. I know he's said it in a letter from a month ago, but what about the 70 letters before then to judges across the Circuit and to your Honor. Not a hint. And that's a relevant §3553(a) factor and specifically relevant to rehabilitation.

Someone who sat for 20 years and thought: I really screwed up. I destroyed a lot of lives. There's a lot of rehabilitation. There's a lot of bringing together you can seek to do. Apologies one could make. Making amends. That didn't happen, it hasn't happened. And that's relevant at the end of the day, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, look, you see I agree mostly with what you say but I still have to come to a number here and that's what makes this job kind of difficult.

So, Mr. Schneider, I don't know whether I can find a reason for giving him less than 564 months based on everything we've spoken about, and there may be a compelling argument to give him more than 47 years. It's your turn to try to convince me that I should not run the so-called -- is

Resentencing 24 it Count Six, is that the one that deals with the murder? 1 2 MR. SCHNEIDER: It was Superseding Indictment Six, Count Four. 3 4 THE COURT: We're dealing with Count Four? MR. SCHNEIDER: Count Four. 5 THE COURT: I got to keep the numbers straight to 6 7 make sure I don't mess up. Mike is going to make sure I'm 8 getting it down right. 9 So the question is: Given the full 20 years on 10 that consecutively, or do I want to give more than 47 years. 11 I can do that, I have all this discretion here to run the 12 consecutive, concurrent. We have to come up with a number 13 and we can technically figure out how we want to carve it 14 up. But it just seems to me that he was the main 15 16 honcho here, so to speak, or certainly one of them. And 17 compared to Bernard, he doesn't compare to him because 18 Bernard was the poster child of rehabilitation and 19 everything else that really motivated me to give him 20 21 years, basically. 21 So the floor is yours. 22 MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Judge. 23 You know, when I came in here today, I was 24 prepared to talk about the change that Mr. Myton made when

you sentenced him 18 years ago. And I disagree with you.

Resentencing

He has exhibited extraordinary rehabilitation and I will get to that. But I've got to respond to the Government's arguments which I find some of them ridiculous. And I'm going to say this because nothing makes me personally more angry in this courthouse than people getting sentenced to 90 years, life, because they chose to go to trial. This was called "The Padmore Robbery Crew." Padmore was a leader. He pled guilty, he got 36 years. You know why he's talking about Mr. Myton should get 47 or 80 because he chose to go to trial.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you.

You know that I am very keen on being concerned about what we called the "Trial Tax," I've written about it. I don't think Padmore was involved in the murder of Davis, if I recall correctly. I know he did a lot of bad things. There's a lot of robberies, a lot of holdups. These were a lot of drug-related people we talk about. We have the loss of life here which I think distinguishes him from Padmore.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't have Padmore's PSR. My understanding that there were three murders that he may have been involved with. But I don't have that information, I didn't try this case. But I will say this: The Government tries to paint Mr. Myton as a leader of this crew. It was the Padmore Crew. Your Honor didn't give him aggravating role adjustment here as leader when he got sentenced.

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

Resentencing

And as I read this PSR, the probation officer seemed to make pains, the original probation officer in 2002, take pains to say this was not your usual top-down crew. This was a diffuse group of people who would find out where there was drug dealers who could be robbed and they would put together a crew and they would do the robbery. And they didn't seem to think anything was leader except for Padmore. I'm not even getting into the police officers here who, as far as I understand, their dockets are partially sealed didn't see a day in jail.

So the leader of this crew or the ostensible leader got 36 years because he pled guilty. And if my client had pled guilty, he likely would have gotten 25 years. That's what I think.

THE COURT: It's hard to predict that. But there is certainly a justifiable basis to sentence somebody after they've been convicted compared to when they plead.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Sure.

THE COURT: But there is a limit to that because it leaves as a point where it would be too punitive based upon what we call the "Trial Tax." I get it.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand that. And, look, I don't -- obviously, and I'm all defense counsel know this and the Court knows this, if you're going to sit through a trial and you're going to hear the evidence and understand

what happened in that way, it's different than reading a presentence report and sentencing somebody. That's obvious.

You know --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt.

I don't have any record of whether there was an offer that was made and turned down. But who knows, it's hard to go back 20 years.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Sure.

THE COURT: It may well have been an offer that was a very good offer that he turned down, I don't know.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know the answer to that either. Obviously, I didn't represent him at the time.

THE COURT: The thing that sticks out, once again, this is a prolonged period of criminal behavior. It was really one-third of his life or more at the time that, you know, he was finally caught and he basically fit the profile of an everyday criminal. It wasn't like a one- or two-year type of thing. It wasn't anything that was unusual in terms of the person's otherwise aberrational life, right? He was a career criminal and I a wanton criminal. And that was something I remember way back which impressed negatively.

Go ahead.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand that, Judge. And I understand that is likely the thing that may differentiate him from his brother Kingsley Bernard. The length of

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

Resentencing

involvement in the robbery crew. Those are the facts of the case.

But the question now, taking Mr. Myton as he sits here before you in 2023, as to what do the §3553(a) factors inform you, tell you to do? And you hit on some of those.

First of all, my client has served the equivalent of a 25-year sentence. He's done 22 years. As you noted with good time, he'd probably get three years off of that.

So he served the equivalent of about 25 years which is a significant sentence. It's not as if he hasn't been punished and the Court obviously has to consider punishment as part of the§3553(a) factors. But punishment has been imposed and I will say part of that it is in a penitentiary.

But because of my client's extraordinary rehabilitation, he was able to move to a medium security prison in New Hampshire, FCI Berlin. And I really take -- I differ greatly with the Government about what is extraordinary rehabilitation.

Mr. Myton, as far as he understood it, was likely to spend the rest his life in prison. Despite that, he did everything right. He has these three minor disciplinary incidents over 22 years. I sent you letters from three separate corrections officers, one of them who calls him a role model. And it's not the for the Government to say just

doing what you're supposed to it is not rehabilitation is just belied by facts that we all know.

We all know that many of the people who come before this court have tens of disciplinary incidents over a much shorter time. They can't get along in prison. And really people who go to prison, especially someone like Mr. Myton, who thinks he's never going to get out makes a decision, right? And that decision is: I'm going to learn something, however long I'm in this prison for the rest of my life. I'm going to learn something, I'm going to do the right thing. I'm going to change my life which is what he did.

Lots of people; in fact, I would say the majority of people who get a sentence like that don't do that, right? And they spend that time in jail trying to get over. You can make money in jail, you can use drugs in jail, you can sell drugs in jail, you can do all those things. Mr. Myton never once did any of that. He changed his life. His letter to you explained that. I explained that in my letter he's going to speak to you in a minute to explain that. It is extraordinary rehabilitation. For somebody who never thinks they're going to get out of prison to do everything he can to make his life better.

You can see in the audience his family. It's not often that somebody who thinks they're going to do life can

Resentencing

have that contact with his family and keep them in his life.

Lots of those people get written off. And that's not

because of the family so much but because of the person who

can't really deal with keeping contact with the outside

world with keeping their life alive.

So it's not just what Mr. Myton did after you sentenced him while he was in prison for 22 years, it's that he did it understanding that he likely was never going to get out of prison.

And I have to say something about the Government mentioning Mr. Myton's litigation before this and other courts. I have to say this. I get the bounces, Judge, and I know you get lots of §2255s and you get a lot of motions that you think are probably frivolous. And I get the bounce when my clients file those and I see them. And every time I get those bounces, I'm like, good for him. And I don't say "good for him" because he should be wasting the Court's time or because I think that motion has a chance of success. I say it because somebody who is doing that is using their prison time as constructively as they can. The one thing that can't stop me from doing in prison is going to the law library researching and writing.

So, yes, and I'm not necessarily talking about Mr. Myton here, lots of prisoners send frivolous motions to the Court. But when they're doing that, they're sort of

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

31 Resentencing exercising the only responsible way to use their time that 1 2 they're allowed in a prison. Like you can't hold it against 3 a guy --4 THE COURT: Wait a second. I don't hold it against him at all. 5 I know you don't. 6 MR. SCHNEIDER: 7 THE COURT: I look over these things. We wrote 8 extensively in each of his applications. None of them said 9 they were frivolous. 10 MR. SCHNEIDER: The Government did. 11 THE COURT: Well. 12 MR. SCHNEIDER: The Government did in their 13 letters. 14 I'm just saying, whenever I see one of those I'm, like, good for Mr. Jones; good for Mr. Smith, he's using 15 16 his time in prison constructively. Maybe it's not -- maybe I don't think it's going to work and usually it's not, but 17 18 that means somebody is going to the law library and spending 19 their time reading and writing rather than all the other 20 things you can do in prison. 21 THE COURT: Well, I don't take the position that 22 these are frivolous applications. 23 MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Judge. 24 THE COURT: Somebody's in jail for the rest of his 25 life has every right to try to really bring to the attention

Resentencing

of the Judge and the justice system such as it is of what he things is wrong and we dealt with him seriously.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I agree with that. My point is simply to reject the Government's argument that displays a lack of acceptance of responsibility.

MR. ROLLE: That's not our argument, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think they're really saying that. Let's move on to something more substantive.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Okay. Mr. Myton is 52 years old and you mentioned we were speaking to the Government. I think his record in prison, his age, his criminal history at the time of the offense. And I have to say this, Judge, you know when you sentenced him, the one thing, when I read the transcript, that stuck out at me is you really seem to focus on detaining him because he was a danger. Like, the specific deterrence part of §3553. And you said at the time, I think you have to be locked up to protect the public.

I don't think that's the case anymore, I think he's proved that. And I think you should feel secure that he could be released and he'd never come before you again. He'd never commit another crime. Somebody does not do 22 years in prison, following all the rules as he has, doing all of the programs, keeping contact with his family if he hasn't changed.

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

Resentencing

So, you know, I wrote in my letter, yes, he had that period of criminality. And I sort of tried to convey why that started and it's not an excuse. His sister got kicked out of the house, he decided to go with her. He was 18 years old, he was looking to help her and he started committing petty crimes and got hooked up with this Padmore Crew and he eventually came before you and got sentenced to 90 years in prison.

So he made all these terrible decisions and he decided to victimize those people and you gave him a sentence for that. But when you gave him that sentence, he had another decision to make and, at that point, he made the right decision. He was 30 something years old at the time. He's 52 now, he's done everything right. He could be released without posing a danger to anybody, I think the record reflects that. I think the other §3553(a) factors warrant a sentence -- and I heard you that you're not going to give him time served, I understand that. But I think the sentence of 27 years, which would be a concurrent sentence on the robbery counts, plus the seven that you believe applies for the §924(c) is well more than sufficient to serve the interest of justice.

General deterrence will certainly be served. That is a significant sentence. The median sentence for robbery in federal courts in the last year was only 22 years. It

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

Resentencing

was less than 25 years. I'm sorry, for murder, that's for murder offenses. So it's not as if giving him the sentence that we requested would be some sort of gift.

THE COURT: I'm always troubled by this, you know, sort of statistics that's tossed out at me that the median sentence for murder is 22 years or 24 years because it really doesn't tell me a lot, you know, because there are murders that require people to be in jail for the rest of their lives and those that maybe they could be released much earlier. They're so fact specific, but we have this general norm here which I don't pay so much attention to, by the way.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand what you're saying, and obviously, you know, it's difficult to inform yourself about comparative offenses that you don't know, you don't know the circumstances. But it is true that as I started off saying here that Mr. Padmore who led this crew, who had the police officers giving him information, got 36 years. And my client sits here, I believe, because he went to trial, chose to go to trial. And I don't want to talk about the Trial Tax, I calmed down since I first started talking to you, Judge, but a 27-year sentence is certainly more than sufficient to serve the interest of justice.

I will just say this: My client, should he be released in this country which is unlikely, it appears I

Resentencing

think he's going to go into immigration custody and likely to be deported to Jamaica. But if he was released in this country, his family is there to support him. They have a room for him. A person who is willing to give him a job is in the audience. He has set up his life to move forward.

THE COURT: Yes. So he's not a citizen, I take it, and I think he's subject to deportation from what I read. He may not be deported, but that also is a §3553(a) factor which I guess I ought to consider as well.

MR. ROLLE: I think he can. I just wanted to heard on a few points from Mr. Schneider's arguments to your Honor but only if he's finished. I don't know if he's finished.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Depending on what you say I'm finished.

MR. ROLLE: Okay. I think the main point is this idea of a Trial Tax couldn't be more irrelevant as we sit here today. As we recognize, we started this proceeding not a single person sitting on this side of the dais was here. I certainly wasn't a lawyer. The people who tried this case are special counsel to the United States, private practitioners at this point. And having -- know nothing about the case, we here are in the best position to give you a sense of what is -- what are we doing here de novo and reading these facts.

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

THE COURT: There are situations which trouble the Court about, you know, disproportionate sentences because somebody went to trial. I don't see it as this type of case.

MR. ROLLE: I agree. My point is only it is certainly not the case that the argument we're making to your Honor has anything to do with that. Having not sat through the trial or known anything other than the cold record and facts displayed here.

THE COURT: There are better Trial Tax cases than this one.

MR. ROLLE: And our reaction to it is same as it probably was to your Honor having sat through it originally. And that is the core of what we're asking for and I think punishment is quite an important factor today. I think the rehabilitation outlined by Mr. Schneider is important, we recognize it. We're happy to hear that. I think it can be accounted for. It does not justify a 22-year sentence, a 25-year sentence, or a 27-year sentence. It just simply does not.

THE COURT: Now, let me get this down straight before I ask Mr. Myton to speak. I just want to make sure with all these charges out there that I have the right combination.

Count One is early 240 months. Counts Two and Six

	Resentencing 37				
1	are also 240 months. And the three and five are out, we				
2	know that.				
3	What is the one that is implicated with the Davis				
4	murders? That's seven?				
5	MR. SCHNEIDER: That's Count Four of Superseding				
6	Indictment Six.				
7	THE COURT: That's Count Four.				
8	So then you would have Counts One, Two, Six and				
9	Seven within the Hobbs Act robberies that would be each the				
10	20-year concurrent time?				
11	MR. ROLLE: Not Seven, your Honor. Seven is the				
12	firearms count.				
13	THE COURT: Let me get that right. It's One,				
14	Three One, Two.				
15	MR. ROLLE: Six.				
16	THE COURT: Six, Seven. And Seven, right?				
17	MR. ROLLE: S-4, Count One; S-4, Count Two; S-4,				
18	Count Six.				
19	And then the second indictment which involves				
20	Davis robbery is S-6, Count Four.				
21	THE COURT: Was what?				
22	MR. ROLLE: Superseding Indictment Six, Count				
23	Four.				
24	THE COURT: It was Count Four, yes. That's the				
25	one that what about Count Seven?				

	Resentencing 38				
1	MR. SCHNEIDER: Count Seven is the §924(c) count				
2	on the Superseding Indictment Four.				
3	THE COURT: So we're talking about One, Two, and				
4	Six, basically, right?				
5	MR. ROLLE: Yes.				
6	THE COURT: And then we have the Four is the one				
7	that involves Davis, right?				
8	MR. ROLLE: Correct.				
9	THE COURT: And the Seven is the tack-on for				
10	either Five or Seven years.				
11	MR. ROLLE: Correct.				
12	THE COURT: After 29 years here, sometimes you get				
13	a little confused.				
14	MR. SCHNEIDER: It's always confusing, Judge.				
15	I just want to make clear that, obviously, this				
16	court has the discretion not only to impose the				
17	robbery-related counts concurrently, but also to impose any				
18	term of imprisonment between zero and 20 years. You don't				
19	have to give him 20 years, that's obvious, I assume, to the				
20	Court. But it's been discussed as if some 20-year sentence				
21	is mandatory, that is not accurate.				
22	THE COURT: I can run One, Two, Six, and Four all				
23	20 years concurrent if I wanted to.				
24					
	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.				

39 Resentencing Seven if I wanted to. 1 2 MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. But you could 3 also impose --4 MR. ROLLE: You could give him zero. MR. SCHNEIDER: Five years for each and run them 5 6 concurrent or consecutive. I'm saying 20 years is not --7 that's the statutory maximum. 8 THE COURT: That's not maximum. I think what're 9 what concerned about is the total number, however we get 10 there. 11 MR. SCHNEIDER: Absolutely, I agree. 12 THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Myton now. 13 mean, we've had a fulsome discussion here. This is how I like to conduct sentences. I don't know how my colleagues 14 15 But to me this is the important thing that we get do it. 16 caught up in the numbers and stuff like that. 17 So I appreciate the fact that you had the 18 opportunity to speak to me. I come into court, I don't have 19 the sentence down pat, I don't do that. So these things are 20 very important. I mean, I have these discussions and to 21 listen to everybody. 22 Mr. Myton, I don't hold it against you that you 23 have been a frequent visitor to Judge Block in terms of your 24

applications. I think a lot of them were well thought out, quite frankly. I think you know we treated this seriously

Resentencing

even though he were not successful. We wrote extensively on this. You were caught up in this matrix in terms of the Supreme Court and the higher authorities trying to figure out what to do with whether an attempted robbery was a crime of violence or not. And a lot of these things were held in abeyance until we finally got that sorted out. But the way it worked out finally is that, yes, robbery is a crime of violence. Attempted robbery is not a crime of violence. And then I have recently wrote the Second Circuit affirmed my Taveras case which said conspiracy is a crime of violence.

So it's really a matrix of things here but we finally got the law straight and you're going to be the beneficiary of the fact that the Supreme Court and the other courts have now sorted all that out. So you're not going to be held responsible for Counts Three and Five, okay?

Now, having said all that, you know exactly what my concern is, I don't think I have to repeat it, but this is your opportunity to speak to me before sentence is imposed.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

18 years old I stood before you at sentencing.

THE COURT: Try to speak up as loud as you can.

THE DEFENDANT: 18 years ago, I stood before you at sentencing. You asked me if I had anything to say. I

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

said I did not. At the time, I truly did not have anything to say.

Today, 18 years later, I feel I have a lot to say.

Not just to this court but to the victims and their family.

If I could go back to time and undo the pain I have caused,

I would but that is not wait life is. All I can say is that

I am truly sorry for pain and the suffering that I have

caused. I know saying "I'm sorry" does not undo the damages

that have already been done but I hope it can help heal some

of the pain.

The person that was convicted 22 years ago is not the same man standing before you today. The day you sentenced me, your Honor, I was not bitter or angry, nor did I disrespect you with angry outbursts or obscene language. Though I knew I was going away to prison for the rest of my life, in that moment I did not see myself going to prison but rather going away to college.

Shortly, after arriving at USP Lee, I had an epiphany one night while I laid on my bunk. I recall a Serenity Poem I read. The first line says, God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change. At that moment, I realized there is absolutely nothing I can do about my situation. The second line: The courage to change the things I can. So I decided to change, to throw the old me in the trash and remake myself into a better man.

Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI, CSR Official Court Reporter

Thankfully with the hope of others, I was able to do that.

And the third line says: And the wisdom to know the difference.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

By understanding that I began to realize the damages and the pain I was inflicting on others. Not just the physical pain but the emotional pain as well. Not just on the victims but on my own family as well. My sister's never ending support was pivotal in my change for the better. Seeing the pain in her eyes whenever she visited me in prison was often unbearable at that times. Also not seeing my daughter Cheyenne and nieces Tisha and Melissa, both were teenagers and graduating high school, and especially my younger daughter Alexis now 22 about to graduate college in May whom I haven't seen since she was four years old and me not being there to witness it is like an unbearable weight sitting on my heart. It helped motivate me to be better, not just for me but also for them.

Through the grace of the creator, I was able to surround myself with people who guided me on how to better myself. I learned how to conquer my situation, to not get lost in the system like other inmates I see getting high all the time, involved in violent altercations, just the cost of being incarcerated.

I became a master of my faith. So to be completely honest, your Honor, I am grateful for the

Resentencing	Resen	tenc	ing
--------------	-------	------	-----

experience. Not that I like being in prison but the experience has allowed me to grow and really understand myself and the pain I was causing others.

It also made me realize that the most important things in life; that is, God, family, and freedom. No one should take the either for granted like I did. No one truly understands the importance of these things until they're taken away. Fortunately, I was able to learn and understand the importance of God, family, and freedom. A lot of people cannot say the same.

So as I stand before your Honor, I am humbled by the experience. I am truly sorry and I offer my sincerest apologies to you for putting you in a position to pass judgment on me 18 years ago. I hope and pray that you can see that I am not that man anymore and grant me the opportunity to prove to you that you can give me another chance.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Myton.

 $\hbox{I'm going to take a little bit of a recess and I} \\ \hbox{will be back in about ten minutes or so.}$

(Defendant exits from courtroom at 1:09 p.m.)

(A recess in the proceedings was taken.)

(Defendant enters the courtroom at 1:22 p.m.)

THE COURT: First, I want to thank counsel of both

the Government and Mr. Schneider for your excellent assistance.

This is not easy. I need all the help I can get and I appreciate your efforts that you made to help Court come to these difficult decisions.

So the total amount of months is going to be 456 months and that's going to be divided as follows:

Counts One and Two and Six is 240 months each to run concurrently. And on Count Four, it's also going to be 240 months, but there will be 132 months that will be consecutive.

On top of that, and in respect to Count Seven, there will be an additional 84 months. And I just want the record to note that I would have imposed the same 84 months even if I did not believe that that was the mandatory minimum. I think it's warranted in any event. So the record should reflect that.

So if the calculation is correct, that means it should all up add up to 456 months. Check it. I try to be careful with the math but these are tricky things.

Three years' supervised release on each count to run concurrently.

The standard conditions of supervised release are the same as they were before. That will also be part of the judgment here.

45 Resentencing We already said there will no fine that continues. 1 2 We have dealt with the special assessment. 3 You're going to let me know how you folks want to 4 deal with that and I think that's about it. 5 Is there anything I may have stubbed my toe on or I may have inadvertently missed? 6 7 MR. ROLLE: No. As to the special assessment I 8 think as part of the judgment, the \$500 is imposed. 9 THE COURT: \$500 will be the special assessment. 10 MR. ROLLE: On the back end of the sentence satisfies. 11 12 THE COURT: You let me know what you want me to do with that maybe we can possibly agree on that somehow. 13 14 MR. ROLLE: Yes. THE COURT: Mr. Schneider, anything else that I 15 may have inadvertently messed up on, I don't think so. 16 17 not easy. 18 MR. SCHNEIDER: No. I appreciate the Court's 19 During the break, I wasn't able to get into 20 PACER but I was able to verify that Mr. Padmore pled guilty 21 to three murders and was sentenced to 36 years. So I don't 22 think that's going to change your opinion. 23 THE COURT: There's a long history here and I 24 wrestled with it and I think I have it about right. I take 25 into consideration everything which I thought I ought to

46 Resentencing think about. I don't have to trot it out again but I have 1 2 considered the §3553(a) factors, the nature of his criminal 3 behavior against all these other things we spoke about 4 today. I don't have to specify it again, I don't believe. 5 But I think it's a fair balance considering everything and he's instead of going to be in jail for the 6 7 rest of life, if he behaves himself, I think he can look 8 forward to having be a free man by the age of 62 or 9 thereabouts I think. 10 MR. SCHNEIDER: Probably in about ten years 11 according to what you've imposed. 12 THE COURT: So I'm satisfied with the balance that 13 I've struck. Thank you all for helping me out. I 14 appreciate it and that completes the sentence. 15 (WHEREUPON, this matter was adjourned.) 16 17 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 18 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 19 20 21 22 moderin E. O . sunother 24 Anthony D. Frisolone, FAPR, RDR, CRR, CRI Official Court Reporter 25